

REMARKS

Claims 40-41, 44, and 46-50 are pending in the Application and are now presented for examination. Claims 1-39, 42, 43 and 45 have been cancelled without prejudice and without disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 40, 41, 44, 46, 47 and 49 have been amended. Support for the amendment can be found at least in Paragraphs [0074] and [0076] of the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 40 and 41 are independent.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

On page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 43-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Office Action states that Claims 43-46 are directed to a system and therefore not considered processes for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. §101. As an initial matter Claims 43 and 45 have been cancelled, rendering the rejections of these claims moot. Claims 44 and 46 have been amended to more clearly recite the features of the present invention. Specifically Claim 44 has been amended to recite the feature “wherein the means for executing bills the recipient,” and Claim 46 now recites “wherein the means for executing bills the sender.” It is believed that the rejection to these claims has been addressed. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action states that Claims 47 and 49 recite instructions which cause the computer to place the pseudo name on the mail object, and that it is unclear how a computer and

program instructions alone would accomplish this. Applicant has amended Claims 47 and 49 to recite the that it is “instructions which cause the computer to have the pseudo name placed on the mail object.” Applicant believes that these amendments address the rejection and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

On page 4 of the Office Action, Claims 40-41, 43-44 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lorch, *et al.*, Intl. Patent Publication No. WO 02/51051 (Reference 1 of the IDS submitted May 23, 2005). These claims are not taught or suggested by Lorch.

As an initial matter, Claims 43 has been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

Independent Claims 40 and 41 are both directed toward and recite the use of a “pseudo name”. Toward that end, Applicant maintains his position that the present invention’s pseudo name is not the same as the proxy address in Lorch. In Lorch, a proxy address correlates to a single postal address in a database. Lorch, pg. 16, ll. 3-4, 18-19. In contrast, in the present invention, each pseudo name contains a plurality of profiles with designated time frames in which the profiles are active. For at least this reason, Applicant maintains that Claims 40 and 41 are patentable over Lorch.

Regardless, to further distinguish Applicant’s invention from the cited reference, Applicant has herein amended independent Claims 40 and 41 to recite that “the address information contain[s] an addressee address and a return to address.” The present invention

teaches “a naming profile including name and address information for an associated user, the address information containing an addressee address and a return to address.” In other words, a pseudo name can have a naming profile with address information containing both the addressee address *and* a return address. Therefore, in accordance with amended Claims 40 and 41, the pseudo name can be associated with two addresses, an addressee address and a return to address, and not just **one** address. This feature simply is not taught or suggested by Lorch.

In striking contrast, Lorch shows a method “for delivering a postal mailpiece to a recipient address.” See Lorch, Abstract. Lorch allows a postal recipient to create a proxy address (not a pseudo name) which is associated with the recipient’s postal address. The proxy address is then used to deliver the mail to a physical address. See Lorch, Abstract. In Lorch, a proxy address is associated with the recipient’s address, since “a proxy address 120 is used to access the database 250 to obtain a corresponding recipient postal address.” Lorch, pg. 25, ll. 17-18. Lorch delivers the mail “at the physical address associated with the postal address obtained from the database.” Lorch, pg. 26, ll. 17-18, and FIG. 3. Nowhere is there any mention of associating the pseudo name with both an addressee address and a return to address.

For at least this additional reason, Claims 40 and 41 are believed patentable over Lorch, and the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is requested.

Claims 44 and 47-48 depend directly or indirectly from one or another of independent Claims 40 and 41 discussed above. These claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merit is

respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

On page 5 of the Office Action, Claims 45 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorch *et al.* The features of these claims are not taught or suggested by Lorch. As an initial matter, Claim 45 has been cancelled, rendering the rejections of this claim moot. Claim 49 depends on independent Claim 41 and, as discussed above, Lorch does not teach or suggest the features of Claim 41. Claim 49 recites additional limitations which, in conformity with the feature of its corresponding independent Claim 41, are not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. Claim 49 is therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of this claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

On page 6 of the Office Action, Claims 46 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorch *et al.* in view of Law, U.S. Patent Number 7,072,845 (Reference A of the attached PTO-892). The features of these claims are not taught or suggested by Lorch or Law, whether considered alone or in combination.

Claims 46 and 50 depend directly or indirectly from one or another of independent Claims 40 and 41 discussed above. These claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merit is respectfully requested.

For all of the above reasons, the claim objections are believed to have been overcome placing Claims 40, 41, 44, and 46-50 in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit overpayments or charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 090457.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 26, 2008

By: Alan M. Weisberg
Alan M. Weisberg
Reg. No.: 43,982
Attorney for Applicant
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
200 East Las Olas Boulevard
Suite 2040
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Customer No. 68786
Tel: (954) 828-1488
Fax: (954) 828-9122
email: ptomail@cwiplaw.com

110397